

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF MEETING

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2008

I. Chair's General Announcements and Updates – CCGA Chair Schumm

REPORT: Regent Monica Lozano made a presentation at the December 2007 Academic Council. Much attention was paid to graduate enrollments, funding, and NRT, in the ensuing discussion. Regent Lozano asked what action the Senate was taking on these issues, and was told about the joint CCGA/UCPB subcommittee on graduate funding and NRT. Chair Schumm proposed the establishment of a special joint Senate-administrative task force, to follow-up on the work of GSAC and develop some sort of a concrete funding plan. Chair Schumm will make a joint presentation with UCSD Chancellor Mary Anne Fox on graduate support at the March 5th meeting between Academic Council and the Chancellors. The Monitor Group will present a presentation on the new UCOP 'roles' at the January Regents' meeting today. CCGA may want to review this report at the February meeting. While the University has not yet officially been asked to plan for a 10% budget cut, there is general speculation is that UC will face a significant cut next year, but the Governor will uphold the Compact. However, adhering to the Compact requires UC to maintain enrollment growth.

II. Announcements from the President's Office—Steven Beckwith, VP for Research & Graduate Studies

REPORT: Vice President Beckwith opened his remarks by noting that the state's budget deficit will have an impact on UC's ability to support its graduate programs. He has a dual role in supporting and advocating graduate education and research.

DISCUSSION: Chair Schumm emphasized that UC faculty are engaged in the actual governance of the University; CCGA has authority over the approval of graduate degree programs. This year, CCGA is actively involved in pursuing funding for graduate support. Regarding NRT, the systemwide Senate put forward a Memorial to The Regents advocating for the elimination of NRT in 2006. Following this Memorial, a joint Senate-administrative group (known as 'GSAC') produced a report; CCGA is currently following-up on this report. VP Beckwith commented that this is a delicate issue with the Legislature; UC cannot simply eliminate it for international students. He is inclined to study how NRT's burden on UC faculty compares with the burden on faculty at UC's comparator institutions. For instance, when faculty hire graduate students, is there a high burden to admit foreign students over domestic students? Are there differences in the burden between different institutions? If there are disparities, a case could be made in Sacramento. He stressed that a strong argument must be formulated before this issue can be brought forward though.

Chair Schumm advised that going to the Legislature for NRT relief may not necessarily be the best algorithm for dealing with the NRT question. Unless the Legislature considers reinstating the marginal cost of instruction (MCOI) for international students, simply eliminating NRT would not solve the problem. Any solutions emerging from the Legislature must come with the promise of new funding. An internal reallocation may be the most practical solution. Towards that end, Chair Schumm has requested updated data on graduate funding. He raised the idea of establishing a joint Senate-administrative committee to follow-up on the work of GSAC. For example, this group could develop a concrete plan to mitigate NRT; examine the measured difference in the per capita support for graduate students, and recommend a growth target.

Responding to VP Beckwith's inquiry to look into NRT's burden at other institutions, Chair Schumm observed that this information is hard to obtain. This burden increases the costs of grants. It was also noted that faculty experiences are sometimes hard to quantify; the differences between disciplines also becomes apparent. VP Beckwith responded that determining an order of magnitude is important; without the appropriate data, it is very difficult to construct a solid argument in favor of mitigating NRT in such external arenas as the Legislature. The Council of Graduate Schools was mentioned as a possible source for such data. Director of Student Financial Support Kate Jeffery noted that UCOP does have some data on NRT policy from other institutions, but it is a few years old. Those data show that UC's NRT is in the middle of the range. Chair Schumm added that determining the break point at which UC faculty will begin to bring in more or admit more international students over domestic students is key. He added that it is important to find out the total costs associated with moving a foreign, domestic out-of-state, and a domestic in-state student through to the Ph.D. VP Beckwith added that CCGA should look into the fiscal policies of granting organizations, such as the NSF, regarding total costs and/or overhead costs. For example, the NIH requires pre-approval for grants with total costs above \$500,000. While VP Beckwith acknowledged that obtaining the data will be difficult, he does not consider it particularly onerous. He also pledged his support to help CCGA gather this data, but encouraged members to contact their colleagues at other institutions to get an idea of where these data points lie. However, Chair Schumm reported has already done this, and cautioned that it would be dangerous to simply compare NRT rates at different institutions; other factors must be considered and fully understood. Overall, though, Chair Schumm acknowledged the value of obtaining a more concrete picture of how NRT affects departments, and how its impact at UC compares to that of comparison institutions.

VP Beckwith also briefly discussed his activities in research. The general observation was made that shortages in research money from such granting agencies as the NIH and NSF are becoming more apparent. How will the University attract better research funding? VP Beckwith noted that his interface is with the campus Vice Chancellors for Research. The big problem is that overall federal research funding is falling. UC does have an office in D.C. to advocate for increased research funding though. That said, there are limitations in how much can be done through such advocacy. He will also work with the Vice Chancellors to improve UC's competitive standing when it comes to grant competitions. For instance, UC is working to develop specific research initiatives that will attract research funding. Another area is the development of new policies in technology transfer, especially as these functions are moved to the campuses. Conflict of interest in technology transfer is another area of concern.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Draft Minutes of the December 4, 2007 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the consent calendar.

IV. NRT/Graduate Funding—*Director of Student Financial Support Kate Jeffery*

ISSUE: Director Jeffery recounted the history of the elimination of NRT for students who have advanced to candidacy. In 1997-98, a 75% reduction in NRT upon advancement to candidacy was instituted. The context for this decision was a general concern about the adequacy of UC's graduate support. However, NRT's impact on research grants had not emerged as such a prominent issue yet. Three directions were available to the UC policy makers. The first was how additional support for graduate students should be structured—via fellowships, reductions in fees (including NRT), and providing targeted tuition waivers. At the time, the level of UC's

NRT was also lower than at some of the University's comparison institutions, which made increasing the level of NRT palatable. Initially, a 5% increase in NRT was proposed, which was later bumped up to 7%, and was coupled with the 75% reduction upon advancement to candidacy. State policy also played a role, as NRT was set at levels comparable to other institutions. In addition, other institutions were charging significantly less for students who had advanced to candidacy. In 2006-07, the question again arose regarding the best ways to structure increased graduate support (fellowships, return to aid, TA fee remission, etc.). However, this time NRT's impact on research grants played a much more significant role, which influenced the decision to eliminate NRT altogether for those students who had advanced to candidacy. This policy change resulted in an actual loss in revenue of about \$8.8 million, as new funding did not exist. Despite the loss in revenue however, this move received wide support within the University.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that if the PI pays the NRT, shouldn't the money return directly to the PI? Director Jeffery responded that campus flexibility is the reason for this; on some campuses more money is redirected to graduate support, but at least a portion is needed for overhead costs, etc. Director Jeffery added that the 1997-98 reduction was subsidized by NRT collected from undergraduate and masters' students. Chair Schumm said that the cost of totally eliminating NRT for Ph.D. students has been estimated to be between \$30 to 40 million. It was noted that Stanford has much higher fees for graduate students, but Stanford's large endowment subsidizes these fees. The real question is whether there are tipping points when it becomes substantially cheaper for departments to admit more foreign students for their Ph.D. programs. For example, are there data showing an increase in non-resident students after the elimination of NRT after candidacy? Chair Schumm remarked that this linkage may not exist because UC is decreasing the burden for different groups—if NRT is reduced or eliminated for students before they have reached candidacy, departments receive the relief; post-candidacy NRT reduction or elimination relieves professors. A lag would also be expected. Departments are also funded on a year-by-year basis. The break-even point will also be different in different fields/departments, with some fields never reaching a break-even point.

Chair Schumm reiterated his point that totally eliminating NRT legislatively is likely not the best solution. The COGD representative suggested that in fields with research grant caps, an argument can be made to subsidize graduate education with a higher percentage of opportunity funds. Regarding the \$10 million that was recently allocated to graduate education, is there any indication if campuses are using it to mitigate NRT? Director Jeffery responded that there is evidence that at least two campuses are using it to mitigate NRT. The first year included a matching requirement, but the second year did not. This money was mandated to go to fellowships, but not only for non-resident students. She cautioned that the next \$10 million is one of the things that may be cut once the Governor's budget comes out.

V. Announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans—*Samuel Traina*

REPORT: COGD representative Traina said that the COGD supports this exploration of graduate funding; a formal request to COGD may be useful. He also reported that the advancement to candidacy fee has increased from \$55 to \$90; the optional fee for master's thesis submittal has been raised from \$45 to \$55. Both fee increases are effective July 1, 2008.

VI. Academic Masters Degrees in a Research Setting—*Chair Schumm*

ISSUE: CCGA is currently discussing increasing UC's presence as a master's degree granting institution. This issue may be also discussed by the EVCs in the near future. Chair Schumm remarked that a document outlining CCGA's thinking in this area may also be helpful. On a

related note, he is also interested in obtaining data on the per capita degree production in different categories among UC's Comparison eight institution: bachelors, professional degrees, doctoral, and total degrees. Time to degree should also be considered.

DISCUSSION: One member asked about the goal of such a document—would it be to encourage the Administration to move forward? Or simply send a message that CCGA would review master's proposals more favorably going forward? The reasons why more students are earning master's degrees also needs to be explored. Does this phenomenon stem from a demand from industry, or does it relate more to a general search for knowledge? Indeed, neither UCOP nor this committee has seen solid data supporting the claim that significantly more masters' degrees are being earned over the historical averages. Financial incentives certainly do exist for UC as a whole, but masters' students do take an enormous amount of faculty time. It is also worth pointing out that what may work well in some fields may not work well in others.

ACTION: CCGA will develop a statement on principles regarding 'Academic Masters Degrees in a Research Setting' over the next couple of months.

VII. Review of the Proposal for a School of Public Health at UC Davis – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Chair Schumm presented a cover letter that summarizes the three letters from CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB.

DISCUSSION: One member suggested that the proponents look at other undergraduate programs in the system (and even some external programs) for data to support the view that undergraduate programs in public health can be very viable. For instance, Berkeley has a very strong and vibrant undergraduate program in public health. There are certain core disciplines that any undergraduate program must have; if they are not accredited, this will be a problem.

ACTION: Members approved the draft cover letter that will accompany the comments from CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB regarding the Proposal for a School of Public Health at UC Davis, pending the final approval of UCPB's letter.

VIII. Review of the Proposal for a School of Public Policy at UC Riverside – Chair Schumm

DISCUSSION: Chair Schumm remarked that this proposal is light in the sense that it looks more like a department than a School; the breadth that one would expect from a School is not there. The proponents are also expecting philanthropy of approximately \$30 million, which is not guaranteed. The School is planning on bringing in 12 FTEs, which would be shared with other academic units.

ACTION: Elizabeth Watkins (UCSF) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

IX. Certificate Programs – Vice Chair Chehab

ISSUE: Farid Chehab presented his draft 'Memo from CCGA about Graduate Academic Certificates,' which was sent via email. He remarked that the use of the official seal is one area that still needs some research.

DISCUSSION: Chair Schumm remarked that the definition of a graduate academic certificate (GAC) is really a subset of #'s 1-6 (specifically #'s 1, 2, & 4). If it is a GAC, then by regulation, it must 1) carry a minimum of three quarters; 2) need not require a capstone; 3) its students must comply with admission and graduation requirements; and 4) must be reviewed by Graduate

Council. It was agreed that #5 (capstone) should be taken out, as some GACs do have capstones; some do not. However, the document can state that typically GACs do not have capstones somewhere in the paragraph below. Another difference between masters' programs and GACs is a lighter load of courses work. Members also advocated a review by an expert reviewer. The local Graduate Councils would govern the initial approval of all GACs.

ACTION: Members agreed to remove #5 from the list of criteria defining GACs and incorporate it into the text. Analyst Todd Giedt will check the Senate Regulations to for any regulations governing the use of the official seal in certificate programs.

X. Setting Conditions for Professional Degree Fee Increases Proposal—*Chair Schumm*

ISSUE: Language had been inserted into The Regents' [Item J1](#) from The Regents Committee on Financial and Educational Policy at the September 2007 meeting. This language requires UCOP to acquire and monitor data regarding access to professional degree programs. At issue is whether CCGA should certify whether the right data is being collected. He also noted that the committee did receive a list of data that is currently not available that would allow one to see if access is being restricted. He suggested that a subcommittee be formed to apprise CCGA of the adequacy of the available data and inform the need for additional data.

DISCUSSION: The example of a department that is thinking of splitting one of its master's degrees into two tracks and charging differential fees for the different tracks was raised. Although CCGA has not resisted differential fees in general, it has stated that such a practice should not limit access. Differential fees across programs are understandable; the institution of differential fees within programs is something else. The justification for splitting programs cannot be made simply on the basis of money; there must be some academic justification.

ACTION: CCGA will continue to monitor this issue; a subcommittee was not formed.

XII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a Master of Public Policy at UC Irvine

ACTION: Gary Jacobson (UCSD) was selected as the lead reviewer.

B. Proposal for a Master of Science in Nursing Science at UC Irvine – *Lead Reviewer Janice Reiff (UCLA)*

REPORT: Professor Reiff reported that she has begun to identify lead external experts in nursing science.

DISCUSSION: The Irvine member commented that there was some concern within Graduate Council that the program/department might be growing too fast.

ACTION: CCGA's review is ongoing.

C. Proposal for a Master of Science in Global Health Sciences at UC San Francisco – *Lead Reviewer Ira Tager (UCB)*

REPORT: Professor Tager reported that three external reviewers have agreed to review the proposal, and a fourth is probably in the works. He is missing internal reviews; given that the UC Health Sciences programs are so inter-related, conflict of interest may be an issue.

DISCUSSION: Chair Schumm advocated obtaining at least one internal review despite concerns over conflict of interest. He observed that it is not necessarily the objective of an internal review to provide a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ decision on a proposal. Professor Tager will identify at least one person for an internal review, which will be kept anonymous.

ACTION: CCGA’s review is ongoing; Professor Tager will obtain at least one internal review.

D. Proposal for a Master of Science in Environmental Policy & Management at UC Davis
– *Lead Reviewer Patricia Springer (UCR)*

REPORT: Reviewers have remarked that as a one-year program, the program is too short and it is unrealistic that most students can complete in that time. Some of the faculty commitments were also questioned. Professor Springer is expecting another external review, and a site visit will most likely be necessary. While there is clear evidence of demand, the program will have to compete with a similar one at Berkeley. The proposal’s ‘novel’ emphasis of training students with backgrounds in science in policy has been criticized by some reviewers who claim that this is really not so novel. It may also be difficult to achieve this in practice. Finally, although the proposal enjoys the endorsement of some marquee faculty, it is unclear what their future role(s) will be.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed with the concerns raised by the reviewers. They also wondered if these marquee faculty would actually be teaching in the program. Finally, some members did not know what kind of a capstone would be required by this program. Professor Springer clarified that there is a practicum report, which is contained in a seminar, and is considered the capstone event.

ACTION: Professor Spring will send a communiqué to the proposers outlining the concerns; she will also plan a site visit.

E. Proposal for M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Feminist Studies at UC Santa Barbara – Lead Reviewer Tyrus Miller (UCSC)

REPORT: Professor Miller reported that an undergraduate program has existed in Feminist Studies since 1988, and it is built on a top-ranked history and sociology departments. The program will be in Feminist Studies rather than Women’s Studies, which is a broader orientation towards gender in historical and social contexts. It will have two graduate degrees attached to it—an M.A. and a Ph.D. In addition, the program envisages instituting parenthetical notations with other disciplines. There is also a high demand for this program. An endowed chair and two dissertation fellowships are already attached to the existing program.

Professor Miller has received three external reviews and three internal reviews; all are consistently positive. They identified the program’s strong and unique interdisciplinary three-fold orientation—race and nation, gender and sexuality, and productive and reproductive labor. There may be some issue regarding the division of labor between these two programs, as they share common courses. All reviews also noted the strong faculty quality. Their critical remarks center on the core courses though. One internal reviewer said that core courses need to be developed in a way that truly integrates these three areas; another mentioned the desirability of a course in feminist pedagogical practices. Professor Miller recommends immediate approval of the proposal. He does not see a need to send a communiqué to the proposers beforehand.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if there would be core curriculum for all students. Professor Miller responded the program does have a fairly stringent core curriculum with some electives. Approval of the program was moved and seconded.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the program with one abstention.

F. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Visual Studies for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Michael Hanemann

ACTION: Chair Schumm will contact Professor Hanemann for an update on this proposal.

G. Proposal for a Masters of Public Health at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab

REPORT: Professor Chehab has sent a communiqué to the program director. The reviewers were unanimous in their opinion that it would be impractical to finish the program in one year. One reviewer noted that there were too few units for the practicum.

DISCUSSION: One member, with a background in Public Health, agreed with reviewers that it would be impossible for anyone to complete this degree if he or she did not already have advanced training in the field (especially biostatistics). Per the new public health accreditation rules, one-year masters' programs must have 42 units. Three kinds of people typically enter these programs: 1) those who want more training; 2) those who are interested in public health; and 3) those (usually physicians) who feel that in order to understand what they are dealing with, that they need the skills found in public health programs.

ACTION: CCGA's review is ongoing; Professor Chehab is awaiting the response from the program proposers.

H. 'Design' Proposal at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Chair Schumm

ACTION: CCGA's review is ongoing; Chair Schumm is awaiting an external review of this program proposal.

XVI. New Business

ISSUE: Members did not have any new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m

Attest: Bruce Schumm, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst

Distributions

1. Draft Memo from CCGA about Graduate Academic Certificates

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)					
Attendance 2007-08		Key: X = In attendance, -- = Absent, Alt = Alternate attended			
		10/2/06	11/6/07	12/4/07	1/8/08
MEMBERS:					
Bruce Schumm, Chair	Santa Cruz (Physics)	X	X	X	X
Farid Chehab, Vice Chair	San Francisco (Laboratory Medicine)	X	X	X	X
Ira Trager	Berkeley (Public Health)	X	--	X	X
Matthew Farrens	Davis (Computer Science)	X	X	X	X
Tyrus Miller	Santa Cruz (Literature)	X	X	X	X
Mark Machina*	San Diego (Economics)			--	
Gary Jacobson**	San Diego (Economics)				X
Janice Reiff	Los Angeles (History/Statistics)	X	X	Alt	X
Anne Kelley	Merced (Natural Sciences)	/	X	T	X
Patricia Springer	Riverside (Botony and Plant Sciences)	X	X	X	X
Elizabeth Watkins	San Francisco (Anthropology)	X	X	X	X
David van Dyk	Irvine (Statistics)	X	X	X	X
Kenneth Rose	Santa Barbara (Engineering)	X	X	X	X
Michael Brown (ex-officio)	Chair, Academic Council	X	--	--	--
Mary Croughan (ex-officio)	Vice Chair, Academic Council		X	--	--
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:					
Patrick Linder	Graduate, UCR	X	X	X	--
Katherine Warnke-Carpenter	Graduate, UCI	X	--	X	X
GUESTS:					
Donald Brenneis	Santa Cruz (Anthropology)	X			
Nina Robinson	Director of Policy and External Affairs			X	
Robert Dynes	President	X			
Kate Jeffery	Director, Student Financial Services				X
Carol Copperud			X		
ALTERNATES:					
Catherine Constable	San Diego (Geophysics)	X			
Lowell Gallagher	Los Angeles			X	
CONSULTANTS:					
Maria Bertero-Barceló	Exe. Dir., Academic Council	X	--	--	--
Steven Beckwith	Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies				X
Suzanne Klausner	Prin. Analyst, Acad. Initiatives	X	X	X	X
Joyce Justus	Interim Vice Provost, Educational Relations	X	--	--	--
Gale Morrison	Council of Graduate Deans (UCSB)			X	--
Samuel Traina	Council of Graduate Deans (UCM)				X
STAFF:					
Todd Giedt	Committee Analyst		X	X	X
Michael LaBriola	Committee Analyst	X			